



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

RAD  
30.5  
5415 Li

GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.  
OCT 24 1900

THE LIMITATIONS  
OF THE  
PREDICATIVE POSITION IN GREEK

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF  
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ALFRED WILLIAM MILDEN

SOMETIME FELLOW OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

---

BALTIMORE  
JOHN MURPHY COMPANY

1900



THE LIMITATIONS  
OF THE  
PREDICATIVE POSITION IN GREEK

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF  
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ALFRED WILLIAM MILDEN  
SOMETIME FELLOW OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

---

BALTIMORE  
JOHN MURPHY COMPANY

1900

880.5

M6415Li

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE GREEK ARTICLE, - - - - -	7
OBLIQUE PREDICATION, - - - - -	10
THE PREDICATIVE PARTICIPLE AS THE EQUIVALENT OF AN ABSTRACT NOUN, - - - - -	15
THE ORIGIN OF THE ADVERBIAL-DATIVE TYPE OF PREDICATION, -	18
THE ADVERBIAL-DATIVE TYPE OF PREDICATION IN (a) CLASSICAL GREEK,	22
THE ADVERBIAL-DATIVE TYPE OF PREDICATION IN (b) POST-CLASSICAL GREEK, - - - - -	26
THE PREPOSITIONAL TYPE OF PREDICATION IN (a) CLASSICAL GREEK, -	29
THE PREPOSITIONAL TYPE OF PREDICATION IN (b) POST-CLASSICAL GREEK,	39
CONCLUSION, - - - - -	43



## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

---

### GENERAL WORKS.

- |                  |  |                        |
|------------------|--|------------------------|
| BERNHARDY, G.    | Wissenschaftliche Syntax.  | Berlin, 1829.          |
| BLASS, F.        | Die attische Beredsamkeit.   | Leipzig, 1887.         |
| CLASSEN, J.      | Beobachtungen über den hom. Sprg.                                      | Frankfurt A. M., 1867. |
| DONALDSON, J. W. | New Cratylus.  | London, 1850.          |
| JEBB, R. C.      | The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus.                             | London, 1876.          |
| KRÜGER, K. W.    | Historisch-philologische Studien, Vol. II.                             | Berlin, 1851.          |
| KRÜGER-PÖKEL.    | Griechische Sprachlehre.   | Leipzig, 1891.         |
| KÜHNER-GERTH.    | Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Part II. (Satzlehre). | Leipzig, 1898.         |
| MADVIG, J. N.    | Syntax of the Greek Language.  | London, 1873.          |
| MIDDLETON, T. F. | The Doctrine of the Greek Article, etc.                                | London, 1841.          |
| MOMMSEN, T.      | Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen.              | Berlin, 1895.          |
| MONRO, D. B.     | Homeric Grammar.   | Oxford, 1891.          |
| PAUL, H.         | Principles of the History of Language.                                 | New York, 1889.        |
| SCHMID, W.       | Der Atticismus, Vol. III.  | Stuttgart, 1893.       |
| SCHOEMANN, G. F. | Die Lehre von den Redetheilen.   | Berlin, 1862.          |
| STEINTHAL, H.    | Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern.         | Berlin, 1863.          |
| VOGRINZ, G.      | Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes.                                   | Paderborn, 1889.       |

### SPECIAL WORKS.

- |                 |   |                      |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| CUCUEL, CH.     | Essai sur la langue et le style de l'orateur Antiphon.                                | Berlin, 1882.        |
| DORNSEIFFEN, I. | De articulo apud Graecos eiusque usu in praedicato.                                   | Amsterdam, 1856.     |
| EGGER, E.       | Apollonius Dyscole, essai sur l'histoire des théories grammaticales dans l'antiquité. | Paris, 1854.         |
| EICHHORST, O.   | Die Lehre des Apollonius Dyscolus vom Artikel. Philol. 38, pp. 399-422.               |                      |
| ELIAS, S.       | Quaestiones Lycurgaeae.   | Halis Saxonum, 1870. |
| FULLER, A. L.   | De articuli in antiquis Graecis comoediis usu.  | Leipzig, 1888.       |



- GILDESLLEEVE, B. L. Amer. Journ. of Philol. 2, 83 ff., 8, 218 ff., 9, 137 ff., 17, 319.
- GUTTENTAG, I. De subdito qui inter Lucianos legi solet dialogo Toxaride. Berlin, 1860.
- HELBING, R. Ueber den Gebrauch des echten und sociativen Dativs bei Herodot. Karlsruhe, 1898.
- HOLZWEISSIG, F. Ueber den sociativ-instrumentalen Gebrauch des griech. Dativ bei Homer. Burg, 1885.
- KALLENBERG, H. Commentatio critica in Herodotum. Berlin, 1884.
- " " Jahresber. des philol. Vereins zu Berlin, 1897.
- MAYER, H. Observationes in Lycurgi oratoris usum dicendi. Freiburg, 1889.
- PROCKSCH, A. Ueber den Gebrauch des Artikels, insbesondere beim Prädicat, Philol. 40, pp. 1-47.
- SPIEKER, E. H. Genitive Absolute in the Attic Orators, Amer. Journ. of Philol. 6, 310 ff.
- STOLZ, FR. Der attributive Gebrauch von *αἰρός* beim sociativen Dativ, Wiener Studien, vol. 20, p. 244 ff.

## THE LIMITATIONS OF THE PREDICATIVE POSITION IN GREEK.

---

A study of the limitations of the predicative position in Greek calls for a brief treatment of the origin and historical development of the Greek article.

Aristotle (Poetics, c. 21) is the first writer by whom the pronoun is referred to as a separate part of speech. He expressly makes mention of the *ὄνομα*, the *ῥῆμα*, the *σύνδεσμος*, and the *ἄρθρον*, though elsewhere he includes the last two under

### THE GREEK ARTICLE.

*σύνδεσμος*. We do not know when the name *ἀντωνυμία* was introduced. Schoemann's assumption, *Die Lehre von den Redetheilen*, p. 117, that it originated with the Alexandrian grammarians is not improbable. He is probably right, too, in assuming that the separation of the pronoun from the article did not take place later than the time of Aristarchus, the grammarian. It is important to remember, however, that this separation was not countenanced by the Stoics, who did not fail to perceive that the article was in reality a degraded pronoun. Under the general name of pronoun, they comprehended both pronoun and article. The Stoic view of the nature of the article—that it is a degraded pronoun—has won general acceptance.

In Homer *ὁ ἢ τό* is the commonest of the demonstrative pronouns. It is a matter of great interest to the student of language to observe the traces of the gradual weakening of the pronominal force of *ὁ ἢ τό*. Accompanying this loss is the growing use of *οὗτος*, *ὅδε*, and *ἐκεῖνος*. The gradual weakening of the pronominal *ὁ ἢ τό* is, however, only another way of characterising the transition from pronoun to article. Vogrinz, *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes*, p. 197, points out one step in the development of the article where the pronominal form and the noun to

which it relates are separated merely by light particles. Cf., e. g., ἡ δέ νυ μήτηρ (X 405), οἱ δέ νυ λαοί (A 382), τὰ δ' . . . κῆλα (A 383), οἱ δέ θεοί (Δ 1), ὃ γ' ἦρως (E 308), τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε, τὼ δέ οἱ ὤμω (*saepe*). The following statistics for the pronominal and articular use of ὁ, ἡ, τό are quoted by Vogrinz (l. c.) from Stummer (Ueber den Artikel bei Homer, Progr., Műnnerstadt, 1886, p. 56). In the Iliad ὁ, ἡ, τό is used as a pronoun 3,000 times, as an article 218 times, i. e., in the ratio of 14 : 1 ; in the Odyssey it is found as a pronoun 2,178 times, as an article 171 times, i. e., in the ratio of 13 : 1. These statistics, as Vogrinz observes, hardly justify us in claiming an advance in the use of the article. That it began to be used with a greater degree of frequency in Homer can be seen by an examination of the later portions of the Odyssey, and in parts of other books. Vogrinz, p. 198, on the basis of Stummer's investigation, illustrates freely the Homeric uses of the article. Some of these may fitly be noted here. (1) With particular words: τοῖο ἀνακτος (A 322, γ 388, φ 62), ἡ πληθύς (B 278, O 305), τὸν ἡνίοχον (Ψ 465), τὸν ἀλήτην (σ 333), τὸν μῦθον (B 16, I 55, 309, T 185), τὴν γαστέρα (σ 380), τὰ δῶρα (λ 339); (2) with particular classes of words, as (a) cardinal numbers: τῆς μέν ἱῆς στιχός (Π 173), τὴν μὲν ἰαν (ξ 435), οἱ τρεῖς (ξ 26), οἱ δέ δύο σκόπελοι (μ 73), τὰς πέντε νέας (γ 299); substantivised participles: τὸν ἄγοντα (Φ 262), τὸν προὔχοντα (Ψ 325); substantivised adjectives: τὸ κρήγυνον (A 106), τὸν δύστηνον (ν 224), τὸν ἄριστον (ξ 19), τὸ μέλαν δρυός (ξ 12); ordinals: τὸ πρῶτον, τὸ δεύτερον, etc. Cf. also τὸ πάρος, τὸ πρίν, τὸ πρόσθεν, τὸ παρόιθεν.

Quintilian (Inst. Or. 1, 4, 19) says of the Latin language: *Noster sermo articulos non desiderat*. With this stage corresponds, in the main, Epic Greek which, as a rule, dispenses with the use of the article. Epic use diverges from Attic at several points. We are familiar with the classification of the article in Attic Greek as particular and generic. Homeric usage is almost wholly confined to the former. Vogrinz (p. 198) gives but two indisputable cases of the latter, viz., τὸν ὁμοῖον (Π 53, ρ 218). Krűger, Dial. 50, 4, 1 and 2, gives other cases which may be considered generic. The use of the article with possessive significance—a not uncommon phenomenon in Attic—is rarely, if at all, found. The substantive generally suffices; occasionally it is strengthened by the possessive

pronoun. The three or four cases that may be cited are inconclusive. Cf. Krüger, *Dial.* 50, 3, 6. There are a few examples of the adjective in the predicative position relatively to the article. The cases employed are the nominative and the accusative. The commonest expression of this class is *ποῖον τὸν μῦθον* which occurs seven times, all in the *Iliad*. Cf., further, Krüger *Dial.* 50, 10, 1.

In passing to the function of the article in Attic Greek, the writer would acknowledge his especial obligations to Krüger among the grammarians who have treated of this subject. In this department of his work, Kühner was in no small measure dependent on Krüger. Worthy of mention, too, is the excellent treatise of Dornseiffen, *De Articulo*, etc., to which Krüger was indebted for some of his remarks on this subject. Viewed logically, the function of the Attic article is to mark the object with which it is used as definite and well-known. The cases, not a few, where no article is used, are best explained as survivals of that earlier stage of the language when the article had not yet come to maturity. Such are *εἰς ἄστυ*, and the like. By reason of this definiteness of import, it is naturally used with the subject, but omitted with the predicate. It is found, however, in the predicate (1) in the case of certain words with which the article fuses, e. g., Plato, *Apol.* 40 c: *δυοῖν γὰρ θάτερόν ἐστιν τὸ τεθνάναι* and (2) where the two parts of the sentence are logically convertible, e. g., Plato, *Theaet.* 145 D: *ἄρ' οὐ τὸ μανθάνειν ἐστὶν τὸ σοφώτερον γίγνεσθαι περὶ δὲ μανθάνει τις*; (cf. Otto Eichhorst, *Die Lehre des Apollonius Dyscolus vom Artikel*, *Philol.*, vol. 38, p. 399 ff.). The salient uses of the article were clearly understood by Apollonius Dyscolus. His classification was as follows:—(1) *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, *par excellence*, e. g., *ὁ ποιητής* = Homer; (2) *κατὰ μοναδικὴν κτήσιν*, e. g., *ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι*—our possessive use; (3) *κατ' αὐτὸ μόνον ἀπλήν ἀναφοράν*. The last is the commonest of all, and in it, as Apollonius saw, is to be found the essential characteristic of the Greek article, viz., *ἀναφορά*. The generic article was characterised by him by the word *ἀοριστωδῶς*, inasmuch as it was not limited, or defined, like the others.

Viewed rhetorically, the article distinguishes the subject from the predicate in accordance with the principle which has been stated. While it may be true that it is not indispensable to a language, as, e. g., Latin, it is invaluable as a means of gaining

precision, e. g., θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος or νῦν ἡ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο. This is clearly set forth by the Greek rhetorician, Theon, in his *Progy-mnasmata* (Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. II., p. 83). There he says: προσθέσει ἄρθρων οὐκέτι ἀμφίβολος γίνεται ἡ λέξις.

The various positions which the adjective may assume relatively to the article in Attic call for brief remark. The adjective may be used either attributively or predicatively. The attributive position is a threefold one: (1) ἡ σὴ οἰκία (2) ἡ οἰκία ἡ σή (3) οἰκία ἡ σή. Of these, the first is the simplest and most natural. The second is called the "oratorical," and carries with it *δγκος* (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1407 b, 35-37). The third is not specifically referred to by Aristotle. In the *Orators* it is the least frequent of the three, and has been characterized by Prof. Gildersleeve as the "slipshod" or "negligent" position. It "affects to be easy and familiar." (See his *Justin Martyr A*, 6, 7, and review of Merriam's *Herodotus* in *A. J. P.*, 6, 262, and *A. J. P.*, 17, 518.) An investigation of the relative frequency of the three positions in the *Orators* and the *Speeches* of Thucydides, so far as the category of the possessive pronouns is concerned, enables the writer to make the following statement. In Thucydides the first position is the normal one, the second is exceptional (three times), the third is found eleven times. In the *Orators*, the first position has, as a rule, the preference. The second occurs about half as often. The third, however, is very rare, there being but ten occurrences in the course of above 2,000 Teubner pages. The predicative position is a twofold one, the adjective being found before or after both article and noun. It is by no means restricted to the nominative or *canus rectus*; for we frequently find the genitive, dative, and accusative cases similarly used, giving rise to what may be termed "oblique predication."

In studying oblique predication, it was found necessary for a clear appreciation of the grammatical phenomena to take account of the participle as well as the adjective, to the latter of which Donaldson, in his classification of predicates as primary, secondary, and tertiary, confined his view; for the participle by reason of its verbal force readily lends itself to the expression of predication in the oblique cases, and the adjective has in this particular assumed the function of the participle. Bolling, *The Epic*

OBLIQUE  
PREDICATION.

and Attic Use of the Circumstantial Participle (Johns Hopkins University Circulars, December, 1897), has well set forth the affinity between the two in these words: "The adjective represents a quality at rest, the participle represents a quality in motion, and the difference between the two is a difference in the degree of mobility." Not only, however, does the adjective assume the function of the participle, but the participle in attribution sinks to the level of the adjective. This degradation of the participle is sufficiently familiar to students of English in such words, e. g., as "interesting," "charming," and the like, which are ordinarily felt as adjectives.

The field of personal observation in this study of oblique predication has been limited to the Orators and Thucydides. Two types in particular have formed the basis of this investigation. They have been denominated "Adverbial-Dative Type of Predication" and "Prepositional Type of Predication."

The first explicit reference to the subject of oblique predication, which has come under the writer's observation, appears in a dissertation written by S. Elias, *Quaestiones Lysurgae, Halis Saxonum*, 1870. On p. 17 he has something to say of the predicative use of the adjective in connection with an oblique case of the substantive. He observes that the construction is found in all the Orators, but that it is used oftener by some than by others. It is found, e. g., four times in Andocides—the fourth oration is included—three times in Antiphon, four times in Hyperides, nine times in Dinarchus. For the rest of the Orators, he contents himself with general statements. He remarks that it occurs often in Demosthenes, oftenest in Isocrates, whose example is followed by Lysurgus.

The next reference to the same subject is made by H. Mayer, *Observationes in Lysurgi Oratoris Usus Dicendi*, Friburgi, 1889. On p. 33 ff., Mayer notes the marked fondness of Lysurgus for the predicative position, as it is called, of the adjective. "Si enim, quomodo collocata sint adiectiva, quaerimus, oratorem in *praedicativa* quae dicitur collocatione adhibenda quasi exultare intellegimus." He cites a number of examples from Lysurgus, and quotes the figures for other Orators given by Elias in the dissertation mentioned. There is added a remark on the stylistic effect of the construction: "etiam tali adiectivorum collocatione plus ponderis

orationem nancisci manifestum est." With this judgment, the present writer is in accord.

It is quite evident from the figures given by Elias that he has examined somewhat carefully the usage of certain of the Orators. If one has regard merely to the number of occurrences, the statement with respect to Demosthenes, Isocrates, and Lycurgus is correct as far as it goes; but looked at in relation to the bulk of Greek which each Orator represents, the statement is far from correct.

A table of the usage of the Orators and Thucydides, in which the speeches of Thucydides are separated from the narrative, is subjoined, giving the number of predicative adjectives or participles used by each writer. Only those orations generally considered genuine are included. In the case of Demosthenes, the division of Blass (Dindorf's edition, revised by Blass, vol. I, pp. 45-6) has been followed.

#### RANGE OF OBLIQUE PREDICATION.

	<i>Pred. Adjs. and Ptes.</i>	<i>Teubner pages.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Lycurgus.....	33	45	.73
Thucydides (Speeches)...	70	125	.56
"    (Narrative).	81	473	.17
Isocrates.....	189	508	.37
Dinarchus.....	11	54	.20
Lysias.....	28	200	.14
Pseudo-Lysias.....	19	17	1.12
Isæus.....	16	138	.12
Antiphon.....	11	99	.11
Demosthenes.....	73	737	.10
Pseudo-Demosthenes....	45	521	.09
Hyperides.....	4	44	.09
Aeschines.....	17	188	.09
Andocides.....	3	67	.04
Pseudo-Andocides.....	2	12	.17

An examination of this table yields the following results:—

Pseudo-Lysias, Lycurgus, Thucydides (Speeches), Isocrates, and Dinarchus stand out from the rest in the preference they give to this construction. At the opposite pole stands Andocides, to whom

the construction was in no wise congenial. Of the remaining Orators, we may say generally that they pursued a middle course. A sharp difference is noticeable between the usage of Thucydides in his speeches and in his narrative. Especially striking is the large use in the Epitaphios of Pseudo-Lysias.

The foregoing results warrant the conclusion that the true home of oblique predication is not in simple narrative which keeps close to the language of everyday life; on the contrary, it is quite withdrawn from that sphere, and is found in language which aims to be elevated, weighty, impressive, and, in a word, strives after effect. Hence the marked preference for it in that much-discussed specimen of epideictic oratory, the Epitaphios. Hence the favor it finds with Thucydides, when he is striving to be impressive. Hence, too, the fondness for it shown by Lycurgus, and, in a less pronounced manner, by Isocrates and Dinarchus. Hence, on the other hand, the marked avoidance of it by Andocides, who was not swayed by the schools of rhetoric, and was, perhaps, the least artistic of the Orators.

The following is the tabular statement of the results reached in an examination of the range of the adverbial-dative and the prepositional type of predication.

ADVERBIAL-DATIVE TYPE.

	<i>Pred. Adjs. and Ptes.</i>	<i>Teubner pages.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Thucydides (Speeches)...	5	125	.04
"    (Narrative)...	12	473	.025
Lycurgus .....	1	45	.022
Isocrates .....	6	508	.012
Aeschines.....	2	188	.010
Isaeus.....	1	138	.007
Demosthenes.....	2	737	.0027
Pseudo-Demosthenes.....	1	521	.002
Pseudo-Lysias .....	1	17	.06
Lucian .....	76	1268	.06
Dion Chrysostomus.....	12	708	.017
Dion Cassius.....	10	658	.015
Diod. Siculus.....	6	444	.013



## PREPOSITIONAL TYPE.

	<i>Pred. Adjs. and Ptes.</i>	<i>Teubner pages.</i>	<i>Percentage.</i>
Thucydides (Speeches)...	7	125	.056
"    (Narrative).	3	473	.006
Dinarchus.....	2	54	.037
Demosthenes.....	16	737	.022
Pseudo-Demosthenes.....	2	521	.004
Aeschines.....	4	188	.021
Andocides.....	1	67	.015
Isocrates.....	7	508	.014
Antiphon.....	1	99	.010
Lysias.....	1	200	.005
Pseudo-Lysias.....	1	17	.06
Lucian.....	94	1268	.074
Dion Cassius.....	15	658	.023
Dion Chrysostomus.....	11	708	.016
Diod. Siculus.....	2	444	.005

These tables yield the following results:—

Half of the Orators are not represented at all in the adverbial-dative type. Thucydides shows the same decided preference for these constructions in his speeches as compared with his narrative. Especially is this to be seen in the prepositional type, where the proportion is above 9:1. Lycurgus is the foremost of the Orators in his use of the adv.-dative type. Except in one possible instance, he seems to have avoided the prepositional type. This may be due to the small amount of his writing which has come down to our time. Four of the six examples of the adv.-dat. type in Isocrates are found in one particular section. Aeschines, while using both types with comparative frequency, prefers the prepositional type. Especially marked, so far as variety of usage goes, is the preference of Demosthenes for the prepositional type. Its ratio to the adv.-dat. is about 7:1. With respect to the usage of Demosthenes, it may be remarked that he uses the prep. type eleven times in his public orations (ten of them being in Forensic speeches), four times in his private orations. Taking bulk into consideration, the public

and private orations cannot be differentiated on this score. The plain style of Lysias avoids the dat. type altogether and uses the prep. type once only, but that in an effective passage, in the 12th oration, where Lysias himself is the speaker. The Epitaphios stands out from all the rest.

It is interesting to compare the usage of post-classic Greek as seen in the writings of Lucian. In the dat. type Lucian outdoes all except Pseudo-Lysias, while in the prep. type even Pseudo-Lysias is not to be excepted. This excessive use of oblique predication is the result of a desire on the part of that writer to impart elegance to his style. Cf. Prof. Gildersleeve in *A. J. P.* 17, 518. Dion Cassius and Dion Chrysostomus, as compared with Lucian, are very much nearer the norm.

As to the true sphere of the adv.-dat. and the prep. type, the writer believes that he is justified in affirming that, of the two, the second strikes a decidedly higher note. The first undoubtedly takes its rise in the language of everyday life. Demosthenes employs it when characterising his opponents, and only in a contemptuous sense. Thucydides, it is true, gives it a higher tone than it usually has by withdrawing it from its ordinary associations and transferring it, as a rule, to the naval sphere. The second, on the other hand, is distinctly elevated in tone, though it draws near, in the hands of certain writers, to the language of ordinary discourse. Demosthenes makes use of it with telling effect in passages intended to be impressive. Lucian does not seem to have appreciated this difference of tone between the two types. They are almost alike to him. Thucydides, by his marked preference for the construction in his speeches, and his corresponding avoidance of it in his narrative, shows that he regarded it as more elegant.

A class of participles, having the value in translation of an abstract noun, call for separate treatment here. These form but a small group in the Orators.

PRED. PTC. EQUIV.  
OF ABSTRACT NOUN.

Antiphon, 5, 35: δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ σώματος ἀπολλυμένου.

Andocides, 3, 27: ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πολέμου χρονισθέντος.

Lysias, 4, 10: ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου βασανισμένης.

Lycurgus, 30: ἐν τοῖς Λεωκράτους οἰκέταις καὶ θεραπαίνοις  
βασανισθεῖσι.

Demosthenes, 18, 57: ἀπὸ τούτων ἐξεταζομένων.

“ 47, 47: ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου βασανιζομένης.

“ 24, 98: περὶ λήγοντα τὸν ἐνιαυτόν.

This use of the participle is by no means restricted to the oblique cases. For the nominative, cf.

Isocrates, 14, 49: ὁ γὰρ κοινὸς βίος ἀπολωλὼς ἰδίας τὰς ἐλπίδας ἕκαστον ἡμῶν ἔχειν πεποίηκεν.

Demosthenes, 54, 12: νῦν δὲ τοῦτ' ἔσωσε τὸ αἶμ' ἀποχωρήσαν.

This construction goes back to Homer. Cf.

N 37-8: ὄφρ' ἐμπεδον αὐθι μένοιν | νοστήσαντα ἄνακτα.

One type of this construction, viz., the predic. ptc. in the sociative dative with ἅμα and the like, runs through Greek literature from the very first. Tycho Mommsen, *Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen*, Berlin, 1895, p. 65, notes that Homer uses it in three expressions only, of the break of day and of the setting of the sun.

ἅμ' ἡοὶ φαινομένηφιν δ 407, ξ 266, ο 396, etc.

ἅμ' ἡελίφ ἀνιόντι μ 429, ψ 362, Σ 136.

ἅμα δ' ἡελίφ καταδύντι π 366, A 592, Σ 210.

Herodotus goes beyond Epic usage, and uses ἅμα quite generally for “with.” See Mommsen, p. 360.

Hdt. 2, 44: ἅμα Τύρφ οἰκίζομένηφ.

“ 3, 86: ἅμα τῷ ἵππῳ τοῦτο ποιήσαντι.

“ 1, 8: ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένηφ.

With these participles, Helbing, *Ueber den Gebrauch des echten und sociativen Dativs bei Herodot*, Karlsruhe, 1898, p. 80, rightly compares

Hdt. 3, 134: αὐξομένηφ γὰρ τῷ σώματι συναύζονται etc.

Thucydides uses ἅμα with the dative much in the same way as Xenophon does later. 42 out of 53 exx. are time-limitations. See Mommsen, p. 383. e. g.,

Thuc. 2, 2: ἅμα ἡρι ἀρχομένηφ.

“ 2, 6: ἅμα γὰρ τῇ ἐσόδῳ γιγνομένηφ.

“ 3, 1: ἅμα τῷ σίτῳ ἀκμάζοντι.

Cf. Aristophanes, Eq. 520: ἅμα ταῖς πολιαῖς κατιούσαις.

In Xenophon, besides the Epic usage, we find kindred expressions:

Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 39: σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς εἰδόσι.

Xen. Cyropaedia 8, 7, 6: *σὺν τῷ χρόνῳ προϊόντι.*

Cf. Mommsen, p. 364.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to the examples of the particular type just noticed, the following may be cited as illustrative:

Hdt. 1, 34: *μετὰ δὲ Σόλωνα οἰχόμενον.*

" 2, 22: *ἀπὸ τηκομένης χιόνος.*

" " *ἐπὶ χιόνι πεσοῦσθ.*

Thuc. 1, 100: *τὸ χωρίον αἱ Ἑννέα ὁδοὶ κτιζόμενον.*

" 2, 49: *μετὰ ταῦτα λωφίσαντα.*

" 6, 3: *μετὰ Συρακούσας οἰκισθείσας.*

" 7, 42: *διὰ τὴν Δεκέλειαν τειχιζομένην.*

Xen. An. 7, 7, 12: *ἡ χώρα πορθομένη ἐλύπει αὐτόν.*

Lucian, Vera Hist. 2, 43: *ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος διεστῶτος.*

" " 2, 5: *ἀπὸ τῶν κλάδων κινουμένων.*

Dion Cassius, 58, 27, 2: *διὰ τὸν Θράσυλλον σοφώτατα τὸν Τιβέριον μεταχειρισάμενον.*

J. E. Sandys in a note to Dem. 21, 49, where he says that *πάντ' ἐξητασμέν'* is equivalent to *πάντων ἐξέτασις* and *ταῦτ' ἀμελούμεν'* to *τούτων ἀμέλεια*, remarks that it is characteristic of Greek and Latin to prefer to use a passive participle in agreement with a substantive, instead of using the corresponding noun followed by the genitive. Marchant, in a note to Thuc. VII. 28, says that the idiom is less common in Greek than in Latin. This statement in regard to Latin requires severe modification. Its beginnings in Latin are very modest, and certainly in no wise prophetic of its development. Rhetoric became its foster-parent, and Livy and Tacitus evinced a predilection for it. See Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax*, 2d ed., p. 439. For the Greek side, see Gildersleeve in A. J. P., 13, 258 ff., 19, 463, ff., and 20, 352, ff., and Stahl in Rh. M. 54, 1 and 3.

In a number of cases which might be cited in this connection, the plasticity of the participle admits of varied conception. These consequently have not been considered.

<sup>1</sup> The usage of *ἄμα* in the Orators is very restricted. See a Programm by L. Lutz, *Die Casus-Adverbien bei den attischen Rednern*, Würzburg, 1891, p. 33. No case occurs where the predicative participle is expressed. Five out of sixteen cases are found in Antiphon, a representative of the older Attic.

The Greek dative, unlike the Latin dative, which is purely personal and is not governed by a preposition, is a mixed or syncretistic case. The elements which have

THE ORIGIN OF THE  
ADVERBIAL-DATIVE entered into its composition are gen-  
TYPE OF PREDICATION. erally regarded as three in number.

They are the *true dative*, such as we find in Latin, the *locative*, and the *instrumental*. These three have become fused in such a way as to make it very difficult at times to determine which conception was present, or, at least, uppermost in the mind of the Greek. The situation, however, is made less complicated, and greater unity is seen to prevail amid seeming diversity, if what is generally conceived as instrumental is conceived as sociative or comitative. The idea that *means* is only a species of *accompaniment* is presented in a convincing manner by Professor Gildersleeve (μετά and σύν in A. J. P. 8, 218 ff.), who, in speaking of the language of Homer, says: "There was no difference in conception between σύν τεύχεσι and σύν θεῶ. The distinction is purely modern. What we regard as subordinate, as a mere appendage, was not such to the primitive man. The man's weapons, horses, chariot, were an extension of his individuality, and the feeling is by no means dead, as is attested by the proper names given to arms, to coaches, to vessels, and by the affectionate feminine pronoun so often employed in familiar English of utensils of all kinds."

The sociative dative begins very simply in Homer, and at the same time quite naturally. The writer is in accord with the view of the genesis of this dative which was presented recently by Fr. Stolz, Der attributive Gebrauch von αὐτός beim sociativen Dativ, Wiener Studien, 20, p. 244 ff. Stolz appears to have overlooked the fact that meritorious work had already been done in this field by Holzweissig, Ueber den sociativ-instrumentalen Gebrauch des griechischen Dativ bei Homer, Burg, 1885. The dative in Homer, in and by itself, sufficed to express accompaniment. Holzweissig and Stolz give examples of this. We may cite:

φασγάνῳ ἀξίας (E 81, K 456, Θ 88).

ἀτσων ᾧ ἔγχει (Λ 484).

ἰπποῖς ἀτσων (P 460).

τοῖσιν ἔπειτ' ἦισσον (Σ 506).



The sociative sense of the simple dative survives in the subsequent literature. As Holzweissig points out, it appears most unmistakably in prose when the dative is used with the names of persons in military expressions, e. g. :

Hdt. 5, 99 : οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπικέατο εἴκοσι νηυσί.

Thuc. 8, 38 : οἱ δ' ἐκ τῆς Λέσβου Ἀθηναῖοι ἤδη διαβεβηκότες ἐς τὴν Χίον τῇ στρατιᾷ.

Ps.-Lys. 2, 32 : εἰδότες δ' ὅτι . . . ἐπιπλεύσαντες χιλίαις ναυσὶν ἐρήμην τὴν πόλιν λήφονται.

Cf. Helbing, p. 84 ff., for a list of similar expressions in Herodotus.

In considering the sociative sense of the simple dative, it will be helpful to notice in this connection one of the most interesting and striking phenomena of Greek with which, moreover, we are, in a measure, familiar. It is the use of the dative with αὐτός to express accompaniment. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 138, note, remarks that in such a phrase as αὐτοῖς ὀβελοῖσι (§ 77), which he explains "with the meat sticking to the spits as before," the sociative sense is emphasised by the addition of αὐτοῖς, and adds that, without such an addition, there would generally be nothing to decide between the different possible meanings of the dative, and consequently a preposition (σύν or ἅμα) would be needed. But, after all, if αὐτός is dropped, all that is lost is the emphasis which it imparted to the expression. This has been made sufficiently clear by Stolz (l. c.). A further cause for misconception has been the occasional use of σύν along with αὐτός in the same construction. This has led Krüger, *Dial.* 48, 15, 16, and other scholars to the wrong conclusion that we have an ellipsis of σύν in those cases where it does not occur. Holzweissig (l. c.) remarks that the mere proportion of occurrences, in Homer, of αὐτός with the dative, and of σύν followed by αὐτός with the dative, shows that the form without the preposition is the original one. The reason why σύν is found along with the dative, he observes, is that the dative has assumed the functions of the *dativus comitativus*. Had he gone further and considered this as applicable to the dative unaccompanied by αὐτός, he would have anticipated Stolz at this point.

The usage of αὐτός in this idiom for different authors is given by Mommsen, *Beiträge*, p. 62. It occurs in Homer thirteen times,

*σύν* being added in three instances. Mommsen's theory, which the writer is unable to accept, is that *αὐτῷ*, like *σύν*, serves to raise the weak instrumental to a sociative. The use of *αὐτός* with the singular is peculiar to comedy and Homer. The tragic use is confined to the plural, and, as a general rule, is concerned with things. In Aristophanes (Mommsen, p. 649), it is used only of things, but in both singular and plural, and with or without the article. The use of the article is restricted to comedy and prose. For comedy, cf.

Aristophanes, *Vespae*, 170: *αὐτοῖσι τοῖς κανθηλίοις*.

" " 1449: *αὐτοῖσι τοῖς κανθάροις*.

" *Equites*, 849: *αὐτοῖσι τοῖς πόρπαξι*.

" *Nubes*, 1302: *αὐτοῖς τροχοῖς τοῖς σοῖσι καὶ ξυνωρίσιν*.

" *Ranae*, 560: *αὐτοῖς τοῖς ταλάροις*.

Eupolis, *Δῆμοι* 37: *αὐταῖσι ταῖς κνήμαισιν*.

For this last example, cf. Meineke, II, p. 475 ff., Kock, *Frag. Com. Gr.* I, p. 284, and Henri Weil in the *Revue Critique*, vol. 12, (N. S.), 1881, p. 293 ff. Weil, in brief, makes this expression equivalent to *αὐταῖσι ταῖς ρίζαισιν*.

Turning to prose, note

Herodotus, 6, 32: *καὶ τὰς πόλις ἐνεπίμπρασεν αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ἱροῖσι*.

Bekker struck out the article here, and was followed by Krüger. In a number of passages from Herodotus, the MSS vary as to the use or omission of the article. Kallenberg, *Commentatio critica in Herodotum*, Berlin, 1884, p. 15 (cf. Helbing, p. 86), after an examination of the passages in question, arrives at the conclusion that Herodotus was not uniform in his usage, but sometimes admitted, sometimes omitted, the article. The principle that Kallenberg has laid down (*Jahresber. des philol. Vereins zu Berlin*, 1897, p. 204 ff.), in the course of an excellent contribution on the article with *πᾶς*, *οὗτος*, *ἐκεῖνος*, and *ὅδε* in Herodotus, that the article is used because of the noun with which it is associated and not because of the pronoun, is applicable also to *αὐτός*. The omission of the article in prose can be explained, as has already been indicated, by Epic survival, e. g., *αὐτοῖσι ἀνδράσι*, which, as Kallenberg remarks, seems to be a crystallized expression used first by Herodotus, then

by Thucydides and Xenophon. Only one instance of αὐτός with the sociative dative was observed in the Orators, viz., in Demosthenes, 22, 68 : αὐταῖς πέδαις.

But words may occupy the predicative position so-called, without at the same time conveying a predicative signification. Such the writer believes to be the case with αὐτός and certain other words, as ἄκρος, μέσος, etc. They are simply appositive. Of datives which undoubtedly carry a predicative signification, the following may be cited by way of illustration :

Hdt. 6, 8 : πεπληρωμένῃσι τῇσι νηυσὶ παρήσαν οἱ Ἴωνες.

Thuc. 1, 6 : ἀνειμένῃ τῇ διαίτῃ.

Aristoph. Eq. 280 : κενῇ τῇ κοιλίᾳ.

Plato, Legg. 880 A : ψιλαῖς ταῖς χερσίν.

Xen. Anab. 1, 8, 1 : ἰδρῶντι τῷ ἵππῳ.

“ Hell. 3, 4, 11 : φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ.

The sociative, rather than the instrumental, sense of such datives as the foregoing is now recognized by Kühner-Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griech. Sprache, § 425, 5, as a comparison with the preceding edition will readily show. “Attendant Circumstances,” “Manner,” and the like, are simply special manifestations of the same dative.

It may be remarked at this point that the participle employed is generally the perfect, occasionally the present. The reason for the predominance of these particular tenses is, in the writer's opinion, that given by Bolling (The Participle in Hesiod—Cath. Univ. Bull., vol. III., p. 466, Washington, 1897) for the Homeric use of participles in direct attribution. “The reason for the predominance of these tenses (i. e., the present and the perfect) is that lasting actions are the ones that lend themselves most readily to attribution, and these are to be found either in the continued action of the present or in the perfect as denoting attitude and resulting condition.” The relation of the participle to the adjective, so far as numbers go, is in the Orators 1 : 12, in Lucian 1 : 6.

A widely different view of these datives is that of Classen who, in the course of his remarks on the expression ἀτελεῖ τῇ νίκῃ (Thuc. 8, 27, 6), notes that we have here a “Dative Absolute,” of which he has given several examples from Homer, Beobachtungen



über den hom. Sprg., p. 155. Compare, further, his notes on Thucydides, 1, 6, 3 and 2, 100, 6, which bear in the same direction. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 213, recognizes in a number of these examples from Homer an approach to a "Dative Absolute." He characterizes them as extensions or free applications by the help of the participle of the true dative (*dat. eth.*). Classen's use of the term "Dative Absolute" has received merited strictures from Spieker, *Genitive Absolute in the Attic Orators*, A. J. P., 6, p. 315. The proper point of view, in the writer's judgment, from which to regard these datives is given by Kühner-Gerth, vol. II. §423, 18, e, f, and g. See also Wölfflin's *Archiv*, vol. 8, p. 48 ff.

Having treated of the origin of the adverbial-dative type of predication, the writer proposes to set forth here the usage of the classical period, with the historians, especially Thucydides, and the Orators as the basis of this study. By way of

ADV.-DAT. TYPE.  
(a) CLASSICAL GREEK.

comparison and contrast, the usage of post-classical Greek will be noted, with Lucian as the model for this period, and an endeavor will be made to indicate any deviations from the norm of classical usage.

The sociative, or comitative, dative may conveniently be subdivided into (1) dative of military accompaniment, (2) dative of attendant circumstances, (3) dative of means and instrument. Some of the examples considered under one of these heads might very well be considered under another.

(1) Dative of Military Accompaniment:—

Hdt. 6, 8, 1: *πεπληρωμένῃσι τῇσι νηυσὶ παρήσαν οἱ Ἴωνες.*

Thuc. 4, 55, 1: *ἄθρόα μὲν οὐδαμοῦ τῇ δυνάμει ἀντετάξαντο.*

Ib. 6, 34, 5: *τῷ ταχυναυτοῦντι ἄθροωτέρφ κουφίσαντες προσβάλοιεν.*

Ib. 6, 37, 1: *μέγα γὰρ τὸ καὶ αὐταῖς ταῖς ναυσὶ κοῦφαις τοσοῦτον πλοῦν δεῦρο κομισθῆναι.*

Ib. 6, 43, 1: *(τοσῇδε ἤδη τῇ παρασκευῇ Ἀθηναῖοι ἄραντες).*

Ib. 8, 80, 1: *ἄθρόαις ταῖς ναυσὶν . . . οὐκ ἀντανήγοντο.*

Ib. 8, 104, 5: *ἀσθενέσι καὶ διεσπασμέναις ταῖς ναυσὶ καθίσταντο.*

The foregoing examples exhaust the list of datives of military accompaniment of this type. None were found in the Orators, where their occurrence would only be incidental. Although Herodotus frequently uses the sociative dative, the example cited above is the only one of this type. Helbing, p. 84 ff., has overlooked it.

Similar datives from Xenophon may be noticed here :

Anab. 1, 7, 14 : *συντεταγμένῳ τῷ στρατεύματι.*

Ib. 4, 2, 11 : *ὀρθίοις τοῖς λόχοις.*

Hell. 1, 5, 14 : *διεσπαρμέναις ταῖς ναυσί.*

In comedy may be noted :

Aristophanes, *Acharn.*, 686 : *στρογγύλοις τοῖς ῥήμασι.*

“ Ranae, 903 : *αὐτοπρέμνοις τοῖς λόγοισιν.*

“ Equites, 205 : *ἀγκύλαις ταῖς χερσίν.*

(2) Dative of Attendant Circumstances : —

Thuc. 1, 6, 3 : *καὶ ἀνειμένη τῇ διαίτῃ ἐς τὸ τρυφερώτερον μετέστησαν.*

Ib. 1, 120, 5 : *ἐνθυμῆται γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὁμοίᾳ τῇ πίστει καὶ ἔργῳ ἐπεξέρχεται.*

Ib. 2, 38, 2 : *μηδὲν οἰκειότερά τῇ ἀπολαύσει τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ γιγνόμενα καρποῦσθαι.*

Ib. 2, 100, 2 : *καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ παρασκευῇ κρείσσονι.*

Ib. 3, 38, 1 : *ὁ γὰρ παθὼν τῷ δράσαντι ἀμβλυτέρᾳ τῇ ὀργῇ ἐπεξέρχεται.*

Ib. 6, 55, 3 : *πολλῷ τῷ περιόντι τοῦ ἀσφαλούς κατεκράτησε.*

Classen sees in the first and last examples an equivalent for the genitive absolute construction. The dative point of view, as has already been remarked, forbids such a comparison. In the second example, the MSS read *ὁμοία*, which some editors adopt. The editors are warranted in making the slight change of accent. In the last case, we have a favorite Thucydidean use of the neuter participle. It is equivalent to *πολλῇ τῇ περιουσίᾳ*.

The usage of the Orators is as follows :

Pseudo-Lysias 2, 18 : *ἐλευθέραις ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐπολιτεύοντο.*

Isocrates 15, 126 : ἀναπεπταμέναις αὐτὸν ἐδέχοντο ταῖς  
πύλαις.

Isaeus 6, 59 : λοιδορήσεται μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ.

Lycurgus 145 : ὁ μηλόβοτον τὴν Ἀττικὴν εἶναι φανερᾷ  
τῇ ψήφῳ καταψηφισάμενος.

Demosthenes 19, 199 : ἐρεῖ λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ.

Ib. 57, 11 : ἐβλασφήμει κατ' ἐμοῦ ταχὺ καὶ πολλὰ καὶ  
μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ.

Ib. 43, 82 : φανερᾷ τῇ ψήφῳ ἐψηφίσατο.

Aeschines 1, 19 : ὃς οὐδὲ καθαρῷ διαλέγεται τῷ σώματι.

Ib. 2, 7 : ἀλλ' ἴση τῇ εὐνοίᾳ ἀκούοντας.

The position of ἀναπεπταμέναις, in the second example, is due to Isocrates' avoidance of hiatus. The contemptuous use of φωνή by Isaeus and Demosthenes is noteworthy. In the case of Pseudo-Demosthenes 43, 82, Blass revises Dindorf's text by striking out the article. He has MS warrant (S F Q). The reason he assigns "*At metaphorice hic usurpatur ψήφος*," does not, in the writer's opinion, carry any weight. In Aeschines 1, 19, for σώματι there is a v. l. στόματι. There is no doubt, however, of the oblique predication. With ἴση τῇ εὐνοίᾳ of Aeschines 2, 7, may be compared ὁμοίᾳ τῇ πίστει of Thucydides 1, 120.

Especially to be noted are the substantives in the foregoing list. They are such words as ψυχή, φωνή, ψήφος, σῶμα, εὐνοία. The list is important for this reason, that it gives us the key to the true home of the construction we are studying. Further verification will be found in the pages following. The adverbial-dative type of predication centres round the body and its parts. The principle of analogy gives the construction a wider range.

The article in each of the examples just cited may be considered as a weakened or fainter possessive. (Cf. Krüger, Sprachlehre 50, 2, 3). The Attic Greek was wont to use the article in characterising various objects with which he stood in some personal relation, where we generally prefer the possessive pronoun. Our English idiom requires the omission of the possessive in a number of cases. For instance, we should not say 'with his voice loud,' but 'in a loud voice.' We may say, however,—and this helps us to understand the idiom—'with his eyes open,' 'with his fists clenched,' etc.

(3) Dative of Means and Instrument:—

Thuc. 2, 49, 5: τῇ δίψῃ ἀπαύστῳ ξυνεχόμενοι.

Ib. 2, 76, 4: ἀφίεσαν τὴν δοκὸν χαλαραῖς ταῖς ἀλύ-  
σεσι.

Ib. 7, 36, 3: στερίφοις καὶ παχέσι, πρὸς κοῖλα καὶ  
ἀσθενῇ παρέχοντες, τοῖς ἐμβόλοις.

Of the Orators, Isocrates is the only one represented under this head.

Isocr. 10, 23: οὐ γὰρ μόνον τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐκοσμήσαντο  
παραπλησίοις etc.

Ib. 15, 47: καὶ γὰρ τῇ λέξει ποιητικωτέρα καὶ  
ποικιλωτέρα τὰς πράξεις δηλοῦσι . . .  
ἔτι δὲ ταῖς ἄλλαις ιδέαις ἐπιφανε-  
στέραις καὶ πλείοσιν ὅλον τὸν λόγον  
διοικοῦσιν.

In the first of these examples from Isocrates, the position of *παραπλησίοις* is evidently due to the desire of avoiding hiatus. The second shows a carefully studied and symmetrical arrangement of the different parts of the sentence.

All the examples of the sociative dative in oblique predication found in Herodotus, Thucydides and the Orators, have now been considered. A few more datives involving the same principle, but not sociative, may be noted at this point.

Thuc. 2, 100: αὐτοὺς πολλαπλασίῳ τῷ ὁμίλῳ ἐς  
κίνδυνον καθίστασαν.

Some conceive this as dative of cause; others as dative of the indirect object.

Thuc. 1, 30: μέχρι οὗ Κορίνθιοι περιιόντι τῷ θέρει  
πέμψαντες ναῦς καὶ στρατιάν.

This is the dative of time. With it has been compared

Xen. Hell. 3, 2, 25: περιιόντι τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ.

Jowett (Thuc. 1, 30, note) claims that the cases are not exactly parallel.

Thuc. 1, 117, 1: ἀφράκτῳ τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἐπιπε-  
σόντες.

Ib. 2, 39, 3: ἀθρόα τε τῇ δυνάμει ἡμῶν οὐδείς πω πολέμος ἐνέτυχε.

Ib. 4, 122, 5: τῇ κατὰ γῆν Λακεδαιμονίων ἰσχύϊ ἀνωφελεῖ πιστεύοντες.

Ib. 7, 39, 2: ὅπως . . . καὶ δι' ὀλίγου αὐθις καὶ αὐθημερὸν ἀπροσδοκῆτοῖς τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιχειρῶσι.

These are datives of the indirect object, with which the predicative adjective stands in agreement, and are not to be confounded with the sociative dative. It is not always easy to decide which kind of dative we have, as, e. g., in the instance cited above under dative of military accompaniment (Thuc. 4, 55, 1). If it refers to the Peloponnesians, we have, undoubtedly, the dative of military accompaniment, in other words, the sociative dative. If the Athenians are referred to, we have the dative of the indirect object. Jowett prefers the former, Krüger the latter, interpretation.

The following datives in the Orators may be noted :

Antiphon 3 γ 6: πολεμίῳ τῷ τούτου βέλει περιπεσών.

Ib. 5, 12: ἀνωμότοις πιστεύσαντας τοῖς μαρτυροῦσι.

Lysias 32, 14: ἐπιτυχόντας ἐκβεβλημένῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ.

Isocrates 8, 104: ὁμοίαις ταῖς συμφοραῖς περιέπεσον.

Aeschines 3, 146: φέρων . . . τὸν κίνδυνον ἀπαρασκεύῳ τῇ πόλει.

These are all, likewise, datives of the indirect object, with which the predicative adjective or participle stands in agreement.

Lucian, who is generally conceded to be the best of the Atticists, has been made the basis of this study, and his usage is instructive for the period. One cannot fail to

ADV.-DAT. TYPE.

(b) POST-CLASSICAL GREEK.

notice, in the Lucianic usage of the sociative-dative type, the salient fact, to

which attention has already been called, that it has, first and chiefly, to do with the body and its parts. But, looking deeper than this general resemblance, it will be seen that, while he observes the letter of the law, he kills the spirit. The Attic Greek used it in circumstances justifying its use. The Atticist paid no regard to circumstances. With him, it is simply affectation.

In classifying the datives, it is found that, as in the Orators, so in Lucian, the dative of military accompaniment finds no scope. There remain, then, the dative of attendant circumstances and the dative of means and instrument. Here, too, the classification, it must be premised, is one of convenience, and is more or less arbitrary. No attempt was made to discriminate the genuine from the spurious dialogues.

(1) Dative of Attendant Circumstances:—

Lucian, Nigrinus 4 : ἀτενεῖ καὶ ἀναπεπταμένη τῇ ψυχῇ.

“ Timon 9 : μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ (saep̄).

“ Ib. 41 : ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς κόλποις.

“ Dial. Deor. 20, 6 : τῷ τραχήλῳ ἀπεστραμμένῳ.

“ Dial. Mar. 4, 3 : ἀνεφγμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.

“ Dial. Mort. 21, 1 : ἀτρέπτῳ τῷ προσώπῳ.

“ Menippus 9 : ἡρεμαίᾳ τῇ φωνῇ.

“ Ib. 18 : τραχείᾳ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῇ φωνῇ. (Cf. Bis Accus. 31, and De Morte Peregr. 3.)

“ De Merc. Cond. 34 : λεπτῇ τῇ φωνῇ.

“ Hermotimus 1 : μακρῷ τῷ χρόνῳ.

“ Zeuxis 4 : ὑπεσταλμένη τῇ ὀπλῇ.

“ Quom. hist. conscr. 1 : λιπαρεῖ τῷ πυρετῷ.

“ “ 45 : ἐφ’ ἵππου ὄχουμένη τότε τῇ γνώμῃ.

“ Eunuchus 11 : ψυχρῷ τῷ ἰδρῶτι.

“ Amores 13 : λιπαροῖς τοῖς χείλεσιν.

“ Ib. 36 : ὑπεσταλμένῳ τῷ τῆς φωνῆς τόνῳ.

“ Ib. 37 : γυμνῷ τῷ λόγῳ.

“ Ib. 52 : ἱλαρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ.

“ Lucius 47 : ἐπανθούσῃ τῇ τριχί.

“ Gallus 6 : ἀνεφγόσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.

“ Bis Accus. 10 : ψιλῷ τιμήσαντες τῷ κρότῳ.

“ De Parasito 49 : φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ. (Cf. Cronos. 16.)

“ Philopseudes 24 : πιναρᾷ καὶ αὐχμώσῃ τῇ λάχνη.

“ Cal. non tem. cred. 24 : ἱλαρῷ καὶ κωμικῷ τῷ προσώπῳ.

“ Navigium 16 : πολλῷ τῷ γέλῳτι.

Lucian, Dial. Meretr. 4, 5: ἐπιτρόχῳ τῇ γλώττῃ.

" De morte Peregr. 32: μυρίῳ τῷ πλήθει.

" Fugitivi 10: ἀτενέσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.

" Ib. 33: ῥυπώσῃ προσέτι καὶ γυναικείᾳ τῇ πίττῃ.

With a very few exceptions, the substantives in the foregoing list belong to the class already described. *μεγάλη* τῇ φωνῇ is especially frequent. Demosthenes used *λαμπρᾷ* also in this connection. Lucian seems to ring all the changes which the construction admits of. This is suggestive of Lucian's method.

(2) Dative of Means and Instrument: —

Lucian, Timon 21: παλαιᾷ τῇ ὀθόνη.

" Dial. Mort. 17, 1: κοίλῃ τῇ χειρί.

" Ib. 10, 12: ἀφθόνοις τοῖς λίθοις. (Cf. Pisc. 1.)

" Zeuxis 3: ἀκριβεῖ τῇ στάθμῃ. (Cf. Imag. 17.)

" Quom. hist. conscr. 7: οὐ στενῷ τῷ ἰσθμῷ.

" Ib. 34: πολλῇ τῇ ἀσκήσει καὶ συνεχεῖ τῷ πόνῳ καὶ  
ζήλῳ.

" Vera Hist. 1, 6: οὐ τραχεῖ περιηχουμένην τῷ  
κύματι.

" Phal. pr. 11: ἀλήκτοις ταῖς ὀδύναις.

" Amores 12: ταῖς κόμαις εὐθαλέσιν.

" Imagines 14: εὐκαίρῳ τῇ ἄρσει καὶ θέσει.

" Toxaris 20: μεγάλῳ τῷ πνεύματι.

" Ib. 60: καμπύλῳ τῷ ξίφει.

" Lucius 42: ἀθρόᾳ τῇ χειρί.

" " 51: πολλοῖς τοῖς φιλήμασι.

" Bis Accus. 10: ἀγκύλῳ τῷ δακτύλῳ.

" Anachar. 31: βαθέσι τοῖς τραύμασιν.

" De Domo 18: ἀθρόῳ τῷ κάλλει.

" De Dips. 11: πολλῷ τῷ αὐχμῷ.

Dial. Meretr. 13, 2: ἐπιχρύσοις τοῖς ὄπλοις.

Convivium 44: χρηστῷ μάλα καὶ βαθεῖ τῷ τραύματι.

Ib. 44: ὀρθῷ τῷ δακτύλῳ.

Nero 9: ὀρθαῖς ταῖς δέλτοις.

These examples abundantly illustrate Lucianic usage. The following examples from other authors may also be noted. The influence of earlier writers is perceptible.

(1) Dative of Military Accompaniment : —

Dion Cassius, 39, 58, 1 : προῖων δὲ ἐντεῦθεν δίχα διηρη-  
μένῳ τῷ στρατῷ.

Ib. 50, 11, 6 : ἀθρόα τῇ παρασκευῇ τὸν Ἴόνιον  
διέβαλεν.

Ib. 50, 31, 4 : πυκναῖς ταῖς ναυσὶν ὀλίγον ἔξω τῶν  
στενῶν παραταξαμένων.

(2) Dative of Attendant Circumstances : —

Dion Cass. 43, 43, 2 : τῇ τε γὰρ ἐσθῇτι χαυνοτέρᾳ ἐν  
πᾶσιν ἐνηβρύνετο.

Ib. 46, 22, 4 : ὅτε γοῦν γυμνοῖς τοῖς ξίφεσιν ἐς τὴν  
ἀγορὰν ἐσέδραμον.

Ib. 49, 20, 2 : πόρρωθεν γὰρ σφοδραῖς ταῖς βολαῖς  
ἐξικνούμενοι.

Ib. 55, 15, 7 : ὥστε καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀφροντίστῳ καὶ  
ἀνυπόπτῳ τῇ ψυχῇ προσομιλεῖν.

Diod. Sic. 1, 70, 5 : μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ. (Cf. 1, 83, 3.)

Ib. 3, 27, 3 : κατακλιθεὶς δὲ ἀθρόῳ τῷ βάρει.

Ib. 3, 29, 3 : πάντες προσφέρουσι ταύτην ἀθρόοις τοῖς  
σωροῖς.

Ib. 4, 48, 2 : ἐσπασμένοις τοῖς ξίφεσι. (Cf. 4, 52, 4.)

(3) Dative of Means and Instrument : —

Dion Cass. 40, 43, 3 : ἐκδιῶξαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς  
πλαγίοις καὶ πλατέσι τοῖς  
ξίφεσι παίοντας.

By "prepositional type" of oblique predication, is meant ob-  
lique predication introduced by a preposition. The plan, pursued  
in the previous chapter, of noting the

PREPOSITIONAL TYPE.

(a) CLASSICAL GREEK.

classical usage, as seen in the histori-  
ans and Orators, and of comparing or  
contrasting with it that of post-classical Greek, is also followed  
here.

Herodotus : —

Hdt. 5, 92, 7 : ὅτι ἐπὶ ψυχρὸν τὸν ἰπνὸν Περίανδρος  
τοὺς ἄρτους ἐπέβαλε.

Ib. 5, 29 : ὅπως τινὰ ἴδοιεν ἐν ἀνεσστηκυῇ τῇ χώρῃ  
ἀγρὸν εὖ ἐξεργασμένον.



These are the only cases found in Hdt. There is a special reason for the predicative position of the adjective *ψυχρόν*. "Into the cold oven" is an incorrect rendering. It might be rendered "into the oven when it was cold." But the brachylogy of the Greek has disappeared. *ἀνεστηκυίη* is best interpreted *ἀναστάτῳ γενομένην* or *ἀναστάτῳ ἐούσῃ*. Stein aptly compares Xen. Cyrop. 1, 3 : *ἐν ὀρειῇ οὔσῃ τῇ χώρᾳ*.

Thucydides : —

Thuc. 1, 19, 2 : *μετὰ ἀκραιφνοῦς τῆς ξυμμαχίας ἦνθησαν.*

Thuc. 2, 43, 4 : *πρὸς ἀνεύθυνον τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀκρόασιν.*

Ib. 6, 66, 1 : *ὅτι μὲν καλὰ τὰ προειργασμένα καὶ ὑπὲρ καλῶν τῶν μελλόντων ὁ ἀγὼν ἔσται.*

Ib. 6, 77, 1 : *ἀλλὰ Δωριῆς ἐλεύθεροι ἀπ' αὐτονόμου τῆς Πελοποννήσου.*

Ib. 6, 92, 5 : *καὶ αὐτοὺς νῦν νομίσαντας περὶ μεγίστων δὴ τῶν διαφερόντων βουλευέσθαι.*

Ib. 7, 84, 4 : *καὶ ἐν κοίλῳ ὄντι τῷ ποταμῷ ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ταρασσομένους.*

Ib. 1, 36, 1 : *τὸ δὲ θαρσοῦν μὴ δεξαμένου ἀσθενὲς ὄν πρὸς ἰσχύοντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἀδεέστερον ἐσόμενον.*

Ib. 1, 74, 3 : *ὑμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τε οἰκουμένων τῶν πόλεων.*

Ib. 1, 84, 4 : *αἰεὶ δὲ ὡς πρὸς εὖ βουλευομένους τοὺς ἐναντίους ἔργῳ παρασκευαζόμεθα.*

Ib. 8, 38, 3 : *οἱ δὲ Χῖοι ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πρὶν μάχαις πεπληγμένοι.*

This array of examples exhibits one of several points of difference between Thucydides and Herodotus. The compactness and precision of this mode of expression certainly appealed to Thucydides. The first example has the rare word *ἀκραιφνοῦς*, which, as Classen remarks, has the force of a time-limitation. The second is a good example of Thucydides' preference of abstract to concrete expressions. Krüger analyses the third example thus : *καλὰ ἔστι τὰ μέλλοντα ὑπὲρ ὧν*. Compactness of expression, of course, is lost by such a resolution. Classen notes the use of the predica-

tive participle *οἰκουμένων* in the eighth example to sharpen the antithesis to what follows. In the next example, Widmann (Boehme's Thukydides, revised by Widmann, Leipzig, 1894) says that we have an abridged expression for *πρὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους ὥς πρὸς εὖ βουλευομένους*, with which he compares Thuc. 4, 41, 2: *ὥς ἐς πατρίδα ταύτην* and 6, 50, 4: *ὥς παρὰ φίλους καὶ εὐεργέτας Ἀθηναίους*. This method of conceiving such an expression—others like it will be adduced later—seems clumsy and quite unnecessary. *ὥς* gives the subjective attitude. *βουλευομένους* is predicative in the same way as *οἰκουμένων*, to which reference has been made.

Having concluded an examination of the usage of the historians, the writer will now pass to a consideration of that of the Orators.

Antiphon:—

Ant. 5, 33: *ἕως μὲν οὖν μετὰ χρηστῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος ἐγίγνωσκέ μου καταψευσάμενος, τοῦτ'φ διυσχυρίζετο τῷ λόγῳ.*

MS N omits the article. MS A has it. Some of the editors follow the one MS, some follow the other. Graffunder, De Crippsiano et Oxoniensi Antiphontis Dinarchi Lycurgi Codicibus, Berlin, 1882, p. 70 ff, remarks that this is one of those expressions which the Greeks are wont to enrich with the article, whereas we are wont to do without it. He compares Dinarchus 1, 67: *τίνας τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχομεν*; 1, 77: *ἐν τοῦτ'φ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχειν*; 1, 102: *ἐν τοῖς ἔξω τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχετε*. Bienwald, De Crippsiano et Oxoniensi, etc., Görlitz, 1889, p. 29, holds that the reading with, or without, the article is correct, but, inasmuch as Antiphon uses the article more frequently in the case of *ἐλπίς*, he would prefer to insert it. Cucuel, Essai sur la langue et le style de l'orateur Antiphon, Paris, 1886, p. 60, under "*Adjectif attribut*," notes that Antiphon quite often puts an adjective "*en relief*," by detaching it from the substantive to which it belongs, and makes it bear the force of the thought. In this way the phrase acquires much vigor and conciseness. He happily illustrates this conciseness of expression by contrasting the following expressions:

Ant. 6, 28: *οὐκ ἀληθὴς ἦν ἡ αἰτία ἣν αἰτιῶνται κατ' ἐμοῦ.*

" 5, 38: *οὐκ ἀληθὴ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπέφερον ἣν ᾔτιῶντο.*

The article should be retained, in the writer's judgment, not because Antiphon uses it more often than he omits it in connection with *ἐλπίς*—for this has really little weight in settling the question—but because the article is anaphoric, pointing back to § 31 *τὴν μὲν ἐλευθερίαν ἐλπίσας οἶσσεσθαι*, where the word *ἐλπίς* is implied, and, at the same time, as Cucuel observes, the expression thereby gains in vigor. For further examples of the predicative position in connection with *ἐλπίς*, cf., e. g., Thuc. 6, 68, 2: *μεγάλην τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς νίκης ἔχειν*. In late Greek, Luc. Longaevi 9: *χρηστοτέρας ἔχειν τὰς ἐλπίδας*. Cf. Sornium 2, Zeuxis 8.

Andocides:—

Andoc. 1, 88: *ὅποσαι ἐν δημοκρατουμένη τῇ πόλει ἐγένοντο*.

Lipsius (Andocides, Leipzig, 1888) brackets *τῇ*. In this he follows MS A (according to Dobson). There is no good reason for omitting the article. The same expression is found in a law in Demosthenes 24, 56, and is used by Demosthenes in 24, 76, where Kennedy misses the point by rendering it "in a democratical state." It is rightly interpreted by Hickie, "when the city was under democratic government," and by Marchant, "in the time of the democracy." Dobree, *Adversaria Critica*, vol. 1, p. 325, compares *ἐν δημοκρατουμένη τῇ πόλει* of Dem. 24, 56 with *δημοκρατουμένης τῆς πόλεως* of Dem. 24, 58. This comparison seems apt, for in the former passage *ἐν δημοκρατουμένη τῇ πόλει* and *ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα* are contrasted expressions, while in the latter passage we have *δημοκρατουμένης τῆς πόλεως* and *ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα*. In other words—with no intention of applying mathematics to language—*ἐν δημοκρατουμένη τῇ πόλει* and *δημοκρατουμένης τῆς πόλεως* are practically equivalent expressions.

Lysias:—

Lys. 12, 97: *οἱ μὲν ἐν πολεμίᾳ τῇ πατρίδι τοὺς παῖδας καταλιπόντες*.

Pseudo-Lys. 2, 49: *ἡγούμενοι ἢ εἰς ἔρημον τὴν χώραν ἐμβαλεῖν*.

The force of the predicative adjective *πολεμία*, which is in keeping with the vigorous utterance of Lysias at this point, is height-

ened by the contrast with the words ἐν ξένῃ γῇ which follow. The word χώρα frequently has its adjective in the predicative position. Cf., e. g., Xen. Anab. 1, 3, 14: ὡς διὰ φιλίας τῆς χώρας ἀπάξει; also 4, 1, 8. Anab. 5, 4, 2: ὡς διὰ φιλίας ἢ ὡς διὰ πολέμιας πορεύονται τῆς χώρας. Arrian, Anab. 3, 3, 3: δι' ἐρήμου, οὐ μέντοι δι' ἀνύδρου τῆς χώρας.

Isocrates: —

Isocr. 1, 34: χρῶ τοῖς λόγοις ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος.

Ib. 8, 12: ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ τῇ πόλει κινδυνεύοντες.

Ib. 14, 40: ἐξ ἀτειχίστου μὲν τῆς πόλεως ὀρμηθέντες.

Ib. 7, 17: παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔλαβον. (Cf. also 8, 30.)

Ib. Ep. 6, 9: τὰς παρ' ἐκόντων γιγνομένης ἢ τὰς παρ' ἀκόντων τῶν πολιτῶν.

In the first of these examples Schneider emends τοῦ to του on the ground that τοῦ πράγματος is not in agreement with περὶ ὧν. Benseler approves of this objection. Schneider admits, however, that the forms of the indefinite pronoun, του and τῷ, are used elsewhere by Isocrates *without* a substantive. R. B. Ponickau, De Isocratis Demonicea, Stendalis, 1889, p. 31, refers to the weakness in Schneider's position admitted by himself, and replies to his objection by denying that there is anything unusual in the circumstance that the singular πῶμα must be referred to the plural ὧν, inasmuch as the neuter plural of pronouns is frequently substituted for one thing. That such a collocation is not at variance with Isocratean usage, he rightly observes by referring to Isocr. 8, 12 (cited above). Blass does not depart from the received text. The current conception of this construction is one which the writer has already endeavored to combat and which he cannot accept here. Schneider gives it as the usual explanation which he, otherwise, would have accepted. It is this: ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος = περὶ τοῦ πράγματος, ὡς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου. He cites the rule that in comparisons, when the object compared is placed first, the preposition is regularly omitted (cf. Krüger, Griech. Sprachl., 68, 8), as, e. g., Isocr. 8, 12: ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ (sc. πόλει) τῇ πόλει κινδυνεύοντες. So Ponickau, referring to Isocr. 8, 12, says

it is equivalent to *ἐν τῇ πόλει ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ*. To this method of conceiving this construction, the writer has two objections to offer: first, it is inapplicable in certain cases yet to be cited, second, where applicable, it seems clumsy and unnatural. Analysis is not at all necessary. The predicative adjective contains in both examples (1, 34 and 8, 12) the point of the passage. It is, moreover, Isocrates' distinct purpose that the word *ἀλλοτρίου* shall stand out prominently, and this effect is secured inimitably, so far as English is concerned, by the predicative position. With the third example, cf. Diod. Sic. 13, 114, 1: *οἰκεῖν ἐν ἀτειχίστοις ταῖς πόλεσι*, cited by Green, in a Johns Hopkins dissertation, Diodorus and the Peloponnesian War, Baltimore, 1899, p. 16.

A special class of the prepositional type is illustrated by such examples as Isocr. 7, 17: *παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων*. Abandoning for the moment the plan of indicating consecutively the usage of the individual Orators, the writer will attempt to give a general view of this class.

With these examples from Isocrates, are to be compared:

Dem. 20, 16: *ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμοίων ἐκόντων*.

Ib. 38, 28: *παρ' ἐκόντων ἔλαβον τῶν ἐπιτρόπων*.

Aeschin. 3, 58: *παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπολαβεῖν*.

Dinarch. 1, 37: *παρ' ἐκόντων καὶ βουλομένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων*.

They reappear in certain post-classical writers, e. g.,

Strabo 5, 3, 2: *παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν ὑπηκόων*.

Ib. 5, 2, 3: *παρ' ἐκόντων ἔλαβον Ῥωμαίων*.

Dion Chrysostomus 11, 60: *παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν οἰκείων*.

Dion Cassius 37, 3, 6: *παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν ἐπιχωρίων*.

Ib. 53, 2, 6: *παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων*.

(Often with pronouns, e. g.,)

Ib. 41, 35, 1: *παρ' ἐκόντος μου*.

Ib. 43, 34, 2: *δι' ἐκόντων τε αὐτῶν*.

Ib. 46, 47, 1: *παρ' ἐκόντων αὐτῶν*.

Ib. 47, 29, 2: *παρ' ἐκόντος αὐτοῦ*.

Ib. 53, 17, 3: *παρ' ἐκουσί σφισιν*.

These clearly form a group by themselves. The type became crystallised.

To return to the usage of the individual Orators :

Lycurgus : —

Lyc. 144 : οὐδ' ἐν ἐλευθέρῳ ἐδάφει τῆς πατρίδος αὐτοῖς  
ταφῆναι τὸ καθ' αὐτὸν μέρος παρέδωκεν.

A departure from the received text was proposed by Dobree, *Adversaria Critica*, Berlin, 1874, vol. 1, p. 325, viz., the insertion of the article between ἐλευθέρῳ and ἐδάφει. Maetzner, *Lycurgi Oratio*, etc., Berlin, 1836, p. 324, noted it, but did not adopt it. Dobree compares for the article the use of τήν in such an expression as εὐορκοτάτην τήν ψήφον ἐνεγκεῖν in Lyc. 13, and often elsewhere. Exactly similar, in his opinion, is Dem. 24, 56 : ἐν δημοκρατουμένη τῇ πόλει. It is, however, not merely a question, as Maetzner sees, as to whether the article is rightly used with ἔδαφος or not—Maetzner cites Dem. 8, 39 : τῷ τῆς πόλεως ἐδάφει ; Aeschin. 3, 134 : περὶ τοῦ τῆς πατρίδος ἐδάφους ; Dinarch. 1, 99 : περὶ τοῦ ἐδάφους τοῦ τῆς πόλεως, etc.—it is a question as to whether there is any special point to be gained by the use of the predicative position. H. Mayer, *Observationes in Lycurgi oratoris usum dicendi*, Freiburg, 1889, p. 19 ff, treating of Lycurgus's use of the article, says that he does not use it with the former of two substantives, in proof of which he cites the passage under discussion and 149 : καὶ τὰς ψήφους φέρεσθαι τὰς μὲν ὑπὲρ ἀναστάσεως τῆς πατρίδος, etc. This cannot be urged as an argument here. In favor of the predicative position it may be said that the idea of freedom is emphasised in this section. Cf. 144 : τῶν μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας τελευτησάντων. Cf., also, for indisputable cases of the predicative position in post-classical Greek,

Dion Chrysost. 7, 19 : τὰ γὰρ ἔχνη φανερώτερα, ὡς ἂν ἐν  
ὑγρῷ τῷ ἐδάφει σημερινόμενα.

Lucian, *Timon* 57 : ἐν ἐλευθέρῳ τῇ πόλει, and elsewhere.

Demosthenes : —

Dem. 4, 55 : νῦν δ' ἐπ' ἀδήλοισι οὖσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τούτων  
ἐμαυτῷ γενησομένοις.

Ib. 18, 298 : ἀπ' ὀρθῆς καὶ δικαίας κἀδιαφθόρου τῆς ψυχῆς.

Ib. 21, 30 : ἐπ' ἀδήλοισι μὲν τοῖς ἀδικήσουσιν, ἀδή-  
λοισι δὲ τοῖς ἀδικησομένοις.

Ib. 18, 258: μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐνδείας ἐτράφης.

Ib. 21, 8: ὥς ὑπὲρ κοινοῦ τοῦ πράγματος ὄντος καὶ προσέχων ἀκουσάτω.

†Ib. 25, 99: οὐ γὰρ δήπου καθ' ἑν' ὑμῶν ἕκαστος ὥς ἐπὶ κυρίου τοὺς νόμους πορεύεται.

†Ib. 35, 22: ἐκείνόν τε τὸν νεανίσκον τὸν δανείσαντα ἐξηπάτησαν ὥς ἐπὶ ἐλευθέροις τοῖς χρήμασι δανειζόμενοι.

Ib. 36, 8: ἀπὸ κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων.

Ib. 36, 8: ἐκ κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων.

Ib. 36, 39: ἐκ κοινῶν ἐλητούργεις τῶν χρημάτων.

Ib. 18, 205: ἃς ἐν δουλευούσῃ τῇ πόλει φέρειν ἀνάγκη.

Ib. 24, 76: ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ τῇ πόλει.

Ib. 19, 120: πρὸς [δια] μεμετρημένην τὴν ἡμέραν.

Ib. 20, 16: ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμοίων ἐκόντων.

Ib. 38, 28: παρ' ἐκόντων ἔλαβον τῶν ἐπιτρόπων.

The first and third of the examples cited above from Demosthenes bear a close resemblance to each other in their structure. This use of the substantivised participle was already observed in the usage of Thucydides. Cf., e. g., ὑπὲρ καλῶν τῶν μελλόντων, περὶ μεγίστων δὴ τῶν διαφερόντων, and Plato, *Apol.* 20 e: εἰς ἀξιοχρεῶν τὸν λέγοντα. Also in late Greek, as, e. g., Lucian and Dion Cassius. In the fourth example the reading of Voemel is followed. Noting that the article is generally omitted, he says: “τὴν Σ, unde Scheibius, *Obs.* in *Orr.* *Attic.* p. 56 coniecit, ut habet Laur. S, πολλῆς τῆς i. e. πολλῆ ἦν ἡ ἐνδεῖα μεθ' ἧς ἐτράφης.” Blass was doubtful, but read πολλῆς ἐνδείας. The fifth example has occasioned difficulty among interpreters. Buttmann says that the mind must conceive the construction as follows: ἀκουσάτω ὑπὲρ τοῦ πράγματος ὥς κοινοῦ ὄντος = “Let him now give an attentive hearing to this matter, as one of public interest.” Fennell renders it “considering that the issue is of public interest.” The literal sense, he says, is “considering that (he is giving ear and voting) in behalf of the case (it) being of public interest.” He remarks that the difficulty has generally been passed over. The principle referred to in the case of ὥς περὶ ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος is inapplicable here. κοινοῦ holding the predicative position bears, as usual, the main emphasis. The copula ὄντος which

is here expressed is more generally omitted. The seventh example defies such analysis as was proposed in the case of Isocrates. In the next example Dindorf read ἀπὸ κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων ὄντων. Blass omits the copula with MSS F and Q, and finds further support in the similar use of ἐκ κοινῶν τῶν χρημάτων without ὄντων. Sandys and Paley (Private Orations of Dem., Part II., Cambridge, 1886) follow Dindorf. On general grounds it is better to omit the copula. In the case of ἐν δουλευούσῃ τῇ πόλει, the context with its prominent ideas contained in the words δουλεύειν and μετ' ἐλευθερίας ζῆν prepares us for the emphatic δουλευούσῃ. The form is not unlike that of the example ἐν δημοκρατούμένῃ τῇ πόλει, which has been noticed under Andocides. They are, however, different in this respect, that in the former case ἐν has a *local*, in the latter a *temporal*, signification. Drake has aptly compared Hdt. 5, 29 : ἐν ἀνεστηκυίῃ τῇ χώρῃ, which has already been noted. Compare, also, in post-classical Greek, Lucian's Timon 57 : ἐν ἐλευθέρῃ τῇ πόλει. The same expression is also found in Nigrinus 13 and Bis Accusatus 21. The next example, πρὸς διαμεμετρημένην τὴν ἡμέραν, is a technical expression which is explained by Harpocration. The judicial day was divided into three parts, one allotted to the plaintiff, another to the defendant, and the third to the judges. Cf. also † Dem. 53, 17 : πρὸς ἡμέραν διαμεμετρημένην, and Aeschin. 2, 126 : ἐν διαμεμετρημένῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κρίνομαι. The last two examples have already been noticed under the Isocratean use of participles.

Aeschines : —

Aeschines 3, 255 : μὴ οὖν ὥς ὑπὲρ ἀλλοτρίας, ἀλλ' ὥς ὑπὲρ οἰκείας τῆς πόλεως βουλευέσθε.

Ib. 3, 58 : παρ' ἐκόντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

Ib. 3, 126 : ἐν διαμεμετρημένῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

In the first case, MSS e h k l give *περί* for *ὑπέρ* in both places. Weidner adopts *περί* in the former place. The principle applied to ὥς *περὶ* ἀλλοτρίου τοῦ πράγματος is pointless here. The second and third examples have already been noticed.

Dinarchus : —

Dinarchus 1, 37 : παρ' ἐκόντων καὶ βουλομένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων.



This example has already found a place under the Isocratean use of participles.

The survey of the usage of the historians and the Orators, so far as the prepositional type of oblique predication is concerned, has now been completed. In the course of the exhibit, special notice was taken of one particular type which begins in the Orators and survives in certain post-classical authors. The marks of its crystallization were quite evident. No small number of the examples which lie outside this province can be distinguished by the fact that the substantive with which they are connected is frequently *χώρα, πατρίς, πόλις*. Notice was also taken of a small group with the substantivised participle. Another small group may fitly be noticed here. This type is preserved among certain of the post-classical writers.

Ant.: *μετὰ χρηστῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος.*

Dem.: *ἀπ' ὀρθῆς καὶ δικαίας ἀδιαφθόρου τῆς ψυχῆς.*

Plato, Protag. 357 A: *ἐν ὀρθῇ τῇ αἰρέσει.*

Dion Cass. 37, 11, 2: *μετὰ ἀκεραίου τοῦ φρονήματος.*

Ib. 38, 18, 2: *ἀπ' ὀρθῆς καὶ ἀδιαφθόρου τῆς γνώμης.*

Ib. 38, 42, 4: *ἀπ' ὀρθῆς καὶ ἀδόλου τῆς γνώμης.*

Ib. 44, 23, 2: *ἀπ' ὀρθῆς τῆς διανοίας.*

Luc. Hermot. 6: *ἐξ ἀτελοῦς τῆς ἐλπίδος.*

Between these and certain examples of the adverbial<sup>d</sup>ative type, such as *ἐλευθέραις ταῖς ψυχαῖς*, there seems to be a close affinity. It will be noticed that the substantives are abstracts, having to do with the inner life of the person. In addition to these groups, there remain a comparatively small number of isolated cases, where a special point is made by the use of the predicative position, and which have, therefore, not been perpetuated as crystallized forms. It has already been observed that Thucydides and Demosthenes especially favor the prepositional type of predication in its different manifestations. And, in the case of Thucydides, the important difference between his speeches and his narrative was referred to, viz., that he uses the prepositional type nine times as often in his speeches as in his narrative.

With the limited usage of the classical period, as has been seen in the tabulated statement and in the former part of this section, stands in decided contrast the post-classical period, as represented by certain of its writers, and, preëminently, Lucian who, as in the adv.-dat. type, has been made the basis of this study. This will, perhaps, appear more clearly if the examples are grouped as far as possible.

(1) It is Thucydides of the Attic writers who favored the preposition *πρός* in connection with the type in question. There are three examples, conveying the idea of opposition or contrast, viz. :

Thuc. 1, 36, 1 : *πρὸς ἰσχύοντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς.*

Ib. 1, 84, 3 : *πρὸς εὖ βουλευομένους τοὺς ἐχθροὺς.*

Ib. 3, 43, 4 : *πρὸς ἀνέϋθυνον τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀκρόασιν.*

There are, on the other hand, eleven examples in Lucian :

Lucian, Piscator 32 : *πρὸς ἀγνοοῦντας τοὺς Κυμαίους.*

Ib. Pro Imag. 16 : *πρὸς οὕτω σφοδρὰν τὴν κατηγορίαν.*

Ib. Toxaris 29 : *πρὸς οὕτω σκληρὰν τὴν δίκαιαν.*

Ib. Gallus 29 : *πρὸς ἀμαυράν τε καὶ διψῶσαν τὴν θρυαλλίδα.*

Ib. Bis Accus. 20 : *πρὸς εὐπρόσωπόν μοι τὴν ἀντίδικον.*

Ib. Rhet. Praec. 23 : *πρὸς οὕτω πολλοὺς τοὺς ἔρωτας.*

Ib. De Electro 3 : *πρὸς ἐναντίον τὸ ὕδωρ.*

Ib. De Domo 29 : *πρὸς οὕτω καλὰς καὶ ποικίλας τὰς ὑποθέσεις.*

Ib. Navigium 9 : *πρὸς ἀντίους τοὺς ἐτησίας.*

Ib. Saturnalia 7 : *πρὸς οὕτω πολλὴν τὴν ἀδικίαν.*

Ib. Demosth. Encom. 17 : *πρὸς λαμπρὰν τὴν Δημοσθένους δόξαν.*

Opposition, or contrast, is expressed here, too, except in the fourth example where *πρός* indicates the direction. The bulk of Lucian, it must not be forgotten, is more than twice that of Thucydides. Still, every allowance made, one feels that there has been a wide departure from Attic usage. Omit the article in a number of these examples, and there is no real loss. This is not true of Thucydides.

Cf. also Dion Chrysostomus 12, 4: *προπέμπων ἀλύπως αὐτὸν, ὥς ἔοικε, πρὸς ἄλυστον τὸν θάνατον.*

Plutarch, 1, 60: *πρὸς ἀντίον τὸ πνεῦμα.*

(2) Of the examples cited above from Lucian, it will be noticed that two have the adjective *πολύς* in the predicative position. There have been observed only two cases in the authors of the classical period who have been examined, viz.,

Thuc. 8, 38, 3: *ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πρὶν μάχαις.*

Dem. 18, 258: *μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐνδείας.*

In the former case the article could not well be omitted, and, with its retention, a different sense would be conveyed by the attributive position. The second case, it will be remembered, is a disputed one. Lucian has fifteen additional examples in which *πολύς* holds the predicative position, e. g.:

Lucian, Timon 13: *ἐν πολλῷ τῷ σκότῳ.*

Ib. Charon 11: *ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ βάθους.*

Ib. Quom. hist. conser. 1: *ἐν πολλῷ τῷ φλογμῷ.*

Ib. Alexander 39: *ἐν πολλῇ τῇ σιωπῇ.*

Ib. " 44: *ἐπὶ πολλῶν τῶν παρόντων.*

Ib. De Saltatione 40: *ἐκ πολλῶν τῶν παραλελειμμένων.*

Cf. also Demonax 31, Gallus 19, Rhet. Praec. 3, Hippias 7, Advers. Indoct. 19, 24, De Dipsad. 2, Dial. Meretr. 14, 2, De Morte Peregr. 19. Similar are Gallus 15, Icaromenip. 17, and Apologia 15.

So Lucian uses *ὀλίγος*, but not frequently.

Lucian, Anacharsis 11: *ἐπ' ὀλίγων τῶν μαρτύρων.*

Ib. Hermot. 58: *ἀπ' ὀλίγου τοῦ γεύματος.*

With the former of these examples, cf. Xen. Hell. 6, 4, 1: *ἐπ' ὀλίγων μοι δοκοῦσι μαρτύρων.* The latter example is interesting in another way, for, earlier in the same chapter, we have the attributive position with the article: *ἀπὸ γε τοῦ ὀλίγου ἐκείνου γεύματος*, where the article is plainly anaphoric, strengthened, it is true, by the demonstrative *ἐκεῖνος*. But, in this example, the article has no such justification. If it is omitted, the sense is conveyed equally as well. In other words, Lucian is here giving

predicative expression to what is really an attributive relation. Post-classical examples to which no such objection can be made are :

Dion Chrysostomus 11, 1 : *μανθάνουσι μὲν μόγῃς ἂν τι καὶ μάθωσι, παρ' ὀλίγων τῶν εἰδότων, ἐξαπατῶνται δὲ τάχιστα ὑπὸ πολλῶν τῶν οὐκ εἰδότηων.*

Dion Cassius 56, 17, 2 : *ταῦτα γὰρ ἀπὸ πολλῶν τῶν ψηφισθέντων σφίσιν ὁ Αὔγουστος ἐδέξατο.*

*μακρός* is similarly used by Lucian.

Lucian Deor. Dial. 10, 2 : *ὑπὸ μακρῷ τῷ ζόφῳ.*

Ib. De Merc. Conduct. 37 : *διὰ μακροῦ τοῦ χρόνου.*

Ib. Jupp. Confut. 7 : *ὑπὸ μακρῷ τῷ λίνῳ.*

Ib. Navigium 44 : *ἐν μακρῷ τῷ βίῳ.*

With the foregoing examples may be compared the following from Aelian, given by Schmid, *Atticismus*, vol. 3, p. 63.

Aelian N A 34, 6 : *ἐν μακρῷ τῷ χρόνῳ.*

Ib. " 36, 3 : *κατὰ πολλὴν τὴν εἰρήνην.*

Ib. " 47, 24 : *ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ αἰθέρος καὶ ὑψηλοῦ.*

Ib. " 112, 30 : *κατὰ πολλὴν τὴν σπουδὴν.*

(3) Several of the examples with the predicative position in Lucian are introduced by the preposition *ὑπό* with the dat. Some of these occur in the groups already given. The following may also be noted :

Lucian, De Merc. Conduct. 23 : *ὑπὸ μεγαλοφῶν τῷ κήρυκι.*

Ib. Herodotus 6 : *ὑπὸ νυμφαγωγῷ τῷ βασιλεῖ.*

Ib. Quom. hist. conscr. 2 : *ὑπὸ μιᾷ τῇ ὁρμῇ* (cf. Anach. 26.)

Ib. Phalaris post. 8 : *ὑπὸ γεωργῷ τῷ θεῷ.*

Ib. Philopseudes 32 : *ὑπὸ πυκνῇ τῇ βάσει.*

Ib. Pseudolog. 17 : *ὑπὸ πονηρῷ τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ δυσφήμῳ κληδονίσματι.*

Ib. Navigium 11 : *ὑπὸ λαμπρῇ τῇ δαδί.*

No instance of *ὑπό* with the dat. in this construction has been found in the writers of the classical period.

(4) The preposition most commonly employed in this type, alike in classical and post-classical Greek, is *ἐν*. In addition to the examples cited in other connections, may be noted :

Lucian, Timon 13 : *ἐν χαλκῷ ἢ σιδηρῷ τῷ θαλάμῳ.*

Ib. De Merc. Cond. 22 : *ἐν ἀμυδρῷ τῷ φωτί* (cf. Alex. 17).

Ib. Apologia 8 : *ἐν οὕτως ἀμφιλαφεῖ τῇ ὑποθέσει.*

Ib. Quom. hist. conscr. 4 : *ἐν οὕτω πολυφώνῳ τῷ καιρῷ.*

(5) The preposition *ἐπὶ* with the dat. is quite common. Demosthenes is the only classical author who makes use of it in prose.

Cf. Lucian, Hermot. 74 : *ἐπὶ σαθροῖς τοῖς θεμελίοις τούτοις.*

Ib. Quom. hist. conscr. 35 : *ἐφ' οὕτω μεγάλῳ καὶ χαλεπῷ τῷ πράγματι.*

Ib. Demonax 8 : *ἐπ' ὀλιγοχρονίοις τοῖς δοκοῦσιν ἀγαθοῖς.*

Ib. Toxaris 35 : *ἐπὶ προδήλῳ τῷ μικρὸν ὕστερον λυθῆσθαι.*

Ib. Toxaris 41 : *ἐπὶ τυφλῷ τῷ Δανδάμίδι.*

Ib. Jupp. Trag. 31 : *ἐφ' οὕτω σαφεῖ καὶ προδήλῳ τῷ χρησμῷ.*

Ib. Rhet. Praec. 24 : *ἐπὶ ψιλῷ τῷ τρέφεσθαι.*

Ib. Pseudolog. 26 : *ἐπὶ πεπραγμένῳ ἤδη τῷ ἔργῳ.*

Ib. De Domo 1 : *ἐπὶ προδήλῳ τῇ νόσῳ.*

Ib. Epist. Saturn. 35 : *ἐπὶ κατεαγότι τῷ ἀμφορεῖ.*

Especially to be noticed, in the foregoing list, are the two occurrences of the articular infinitive with the adjective in the predicative position. There is no similar occurrence in classical Greek within the range of authors examined.

(6) Finally may be noted a small prepositional group which is closely related to the adverbial-dative group in the character of the substantives which are used.

Lucian, Nigrinus 11 : *ἀπὸ γυμνοῦ . . . τοῦ μοῦ προσώπου.*

Ib. Toxaris 19 : *ἀπὸ ψιλῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς.*

Ib. Toxaris 60 : *ἀπὸ γυμνῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς.*

The presence of the possessive is to be noticed in the first of these examples. The construction is usually not so transparent as it is here.

This concludes the survey of post-classical Greek, especially as seen in the pages of Lucian, who fairly revels in this construction.

The words of I. Guttentag, *De subdito qui inter Lucianos legi solet dialogo Toxaride*, Berlin, 1860, p. 44, in this connection, are substantially well-founded: "Proprium hoc quoque Luciani est, quod multo frequentius quam alii scriptores articulum inter adiectivum et substantivum ponit, et ita quidem, ut articulus nonnumquam adiectivum antecedere, multo saepius integra sententia omitti possit. Oratio tamen *elegantior* interdum est, si articulus adiectivum sequitur, quam si praepositur, *quaesita* saepe *magis* videtur, si articulus usurpatur, quam si omittitur."

After noting the views current in antiquity among the grammarians with reference to the nature of the Greek article, and showing how the article gradually

CONCLUSION.

developed from the demonstrative pronoun, the writer entered upon a consideration of the subject of oblique predication, in which was included the use of adjective and participle alike. The range of this construction was given for the Attic Orators and Thucydides, and a more especial study was made of two types which were denominated the adverbial-dative and the prepositional. The limitations in the use of these two types on the part of the classical authors were observed, and by a comparison with post-classical authors, more especially Lucian, the deviations from the norm of Attic usage were indicated. The origin of the comitative, or sociative, dative was briefly considered, and it was shown that the dat. type is mainly concerned with the body and its parts, any expansions being due to the workings of the principle of analogy. The prepositional type was seen to possess a higher character than the adv.-dat. type, and, as a consequence, was used, when impressiveness was sought, by Thucydides, in particular, of the historians, with the important qualification that it is mainly restricted to his speeches, and for this very reason, and by Demosthenes of the Orators. Many of these expressions, as was shown, crystallised and were imitated by certain post-classical writers. The home of oblique predication in general, and of the prepositional type in particular, was seen to be in oratory which seeks to be vigorous, concise, and impressive—in fine, in Epideictic Oratory.

